

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 7, 9, 17 – 19 remain in this application. Claim 1, has been amended. Claims 8, 10-16 have been canceled.

Telephone Interview

Applicant's Agent held a telephone conference with the Examiner on January 21, 2005, and discussed whether the Examiner would consider an amendment to change the transitional phrase in claim 1 from "comprising" to "consisting of" to raise new issues. Applicant's Agent also inquired as to an amendment incorporating a limitation wherein the cable keeper is "substantially flat" into claim 1. The Examiner related that she believed "consisting of" would likely not raise new issues, but that "substantially flat" would likely raise new issues. No opinion as to patentability was offered.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8 – 9, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,852,832 to Delaney.

The Examiner asserts that Delaney discloses all of the limitations of Applicants invention.

Applicant believes the amendment to claim 1 overcomes the rejection. As discussed in Applicant's previous response, a "sheet" is something that is thin in comparison with its length and breadth. It is clear from Figures 1-6, and the description presented in column 2, lines 9-55 of Delaney that the light strip of Delaney does not consist of a single sheet of flexible material having an adhesive on a face thereof. For example, Figure 5 shows that the light strip holder is "L" shaped and comprised of two orthogonal portions, legs 11 and 12. That is, the light strip holder includes a significant orthogonal plane, or dimension, leg 12, to the plane of leg 11. Thus, Delany does not disclose a device consisting of a single sheet of flexible material having at least one edge and a plurality of openings spaced adjacent to the edge, each opening having a slot extending between the opening and the edge to allow a passage of at least one cable and an adhesive disposed on a face of the sheet for adhering the cable keeper to an object.

Claims 3 – 5, 7 and 10 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,852,832 to Delaney.

Applicant believes the amendment to claim 1 overcomes the rejection. Delaney does not disclose, or fairly suggest a device consisting of a single sheet of flexible material having at least one edge and a plurality of openings spaced adjacent to the edge, each opening having a slot extending between the opening and the edge to allow a passage of at least one cable and an adhesive disposed on a face of the sheet for adhering the cable keeper to an object.

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, Applicant believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be entered and a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicant believes that a one month extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely, and respectfully requests that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the credit card account as provided on accompanying form PTO 2038.

Please direct any questions or comments to Kevin M. Able at 607-937-4235.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 2/17/05



Kevin M. Able
Agent for Assignee
Reg. No. 52,401
2825 Hickock Road
Corning, NY 14830